

Meeting Summary
BDAC Ecosystem Roundtable Meeting
July 11, 1997

Roundtable Members in Attendance

Gary Bobker (TBI)

Rod Fujita (EDF)

Bill Gaines (CWA)

Greg Gartrell (CCWD)

Jeff Jaraczski (NCWA)

John Mills (RCRC)

Hari Modi (NCPA)

Jason Peltier (CVPWA)

Tim Quinn (MWD)

Allen Short (MID)

Walt Wadlow (SCVWD)

David Yardas (EDF)

Tom Zuckerman (CDWA)

Liaisons in Attendance

Marc Luesebrink (Resources Agency)

Joel Medlin (USFWS)

Karen Schwinn (US EPA)

Perry Herrgesell (DFG)

Action Items and Decisions

1. CALFED staff should provide Integration Panel recommendations for prioritization of proposal selection factors (species, project type, geographic region, etc) of RFP at the next meeting.
2. CALFED staff should consider the following four ideas:
 - Have a member of the Roundtable act as chair of the Integration Panel.
 - Make the balance between agency and nonagency members on the Integration Panel and technical panels as close as possible, considering the majority agency requirement.
 - Panel members should recuse themselves from discussion or voting when a proposal affects their organization or program.
 - Work with nonprofit organizations through the process.
 - Put a representative from a small nonprofit organization on the Integration Panel.
3. CALFED staff should report back to Roundtable regarding proposals received with attention to any gaps in proposal types and applicant representation.
4. Have a presentation on the CVPIA , Anadromous Fisheries Restoration Project at the next meeting.
5. Roundtable members were asked to provide input regarding names for the Integration Panel and the Technical Review Panels.

Future meetings of the Roundtable

Wednesday, August 13 9:30 a.m. to 4:00 pm (changed from August 8th)

Friday, September 12 - 9:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Friday, October 10

Friday, November 14

Friday, December 12

Update on the RFP Status

Kate Hansel provided an overview of the RFP status.

- The RFP was released June 13.
- On July 3, 1997, over 300 people attended the Public Workshop in Sacramento.
- A list of questions on the RFP and responses will be sent to potential applicants. A draft was distributed at the meeting.
- July 28, 1997 - deadline for receipt of RFP
- August - Technical Panels review RFP
- September - Roundtable reviews recommended funding package
- October - CALFED and Resource Agency approve final funding package

Proposal Evaluation and Selection Process

Kate Hansel described the role of the Roundtable in the proposal evaluation and selection process summarized in a one-page handout distributed at the meeting. Ken Williams (Office of Attorney General) answered specific legal questions. This handout is attached to meeting notes.

There was considerable discussion regarding the issuance of the RFP under State Contract Law. Participants agreed that contract law limits the Roundtable's input and that grant authority would have been much more efficient. Under contract law, proposals are not public information until selections are final. The current RFP cannot be changed to a grant system without invalidating the RFP.

Roundtable comments:

- Roundtable questioned value of commenting on summary of proposals without seeing individual proposals
- Roundtable wants to review and comment on Integration Panel priorities being the panel applies the priorities to the proposals.
- After selection of proposals, the Roundtable wants to be involved closely in reviewing the progress of funded projects.

Review Panels

There was considerable debate surrounding the Integration Panel and the Technical Review Panels. The purpose of the Technical Review Panels is to evaluate and score proposals. Technical Review Panels will be organized by type of proposal with possible sub-panels organized geographically within proposal type.

In reviewing the Technical Review Panel's proposal scores the Integration Panel will recommend a set of proposals based on the relative priorities of different species, habitats, and stressors. The factors to be used in recommending projects was included in the meeting packet. The Roundtable will review and provide advice on the Integration Panel's prioritization.

Roundtable comments:

- The Roundtable decided review the Integration Panel's prioritization of selection factors at the next meeting and not prioritize the various factors themselves.

Factors to be Used in Determining a Recommended Set of Projects

The Roundtable reviewed Attachment 3, "Factors to be Used in Determining a Recommended Set of Projects" from the meeting packet and made the following comments or suggestions:

- clarification: *F. Consistency and Integration Between Projects* - the purpose of this factor is to maximize synergistic benefits and avoid projects which conflict
- clarification: species priorities are based on the ranking in the RFP, not the Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan.

Selection of Integration Panel and Technical Review Panel Members

A handout listing candidates for the Integration Panel was handed out at the meeting and is attached to these meeting notes. The 15 member Integration Panel will be selected in late July and will meet in August.

There was much concern regarding conflict of interest on the Panels. Some participants wanted governmental agency panelists to recuse themselves from deliberating or voting on a proposal from their own agency. It was noted that agencies are often very large and that an agency panel member may have no direct relationship to a proposal. Some suggested that agency members could use their own judgment to recuse themselves if there was a conflict of interest. For instance, if the agency panel member's own division or office submitted a proposal, there might be a conflict of interest.

There was also much discussion on achieving a balanced representation of interests on the panel. It was suggested that some non-profit organizations fear that their proposals can not compete with governmental proposals.

Roundtable comments:

- have at least one representative from a small, local environmental group on the panel
- provide the Roundtable and Integration Panel with a summary of the RFP applicants to determine if any particular group, especially small non-profit, is under represented
- have Roundtable select a chairperson
- have a non-voting member of the Roundtable oversee the Integration Panel deliberations
- achieve balance representation on the Integration Panel
- consider agency panel member recusal on agency proposals
- help small non-profit organizations gain access and provide input to this process

Overview of Contract Administration

Kate Hansel described the contract administration process. Generally, CALFED will administer State and federal government contracts and NFWF will administer local and private contracts.

Participants discussed a handout distributed at the meeting, Category III Contract Management, and is attached to these meeting notes. Members of the Roundtable reiterated the need for fiscal reporting to the Roundtable regarding contract status.

It is expected that project contractors will be required to submit programmatic quarterly progress reports.

Next Steps: 6 to 12 Months

Time Line:

- September Roundtable meeting - receive recommended project packet
- early October - CALFED decisions on proposals

Lessons Learned--(items listed below are a summary of the brainstorming session)

- Two funding cycles per year is difficult and requires careful planning.
- 2 cycles/year keeps momentum going
- with multiple cycles/year RFP's can focus on specific issues
- 2/year is good for applicants, do not have to wait a full year to apply if the first cycle is missed
- do not rush the next cycle, the Roundtable must first define its role in the process
- cycles do not have to be on strict six-month or one-year cycles
- designate a percentage of funds to specific types of proposals within an RFP
- six weeks may not be sufficient time to prepare proposals
- RFP funds should be spent early to show Congress that CALFED is ready to spend its full funding request

3. Prioritization Process

- the Roundtable should examine gaps in proposals and funding emphasis
- look for results on prioritization from ERPP Scientific Review Panel
- stressor/species should be prioritized at the watershed level, not the system-wide level
- get feedback from other technical panels, i.e. CVPIA panels
- have a workshop on watershed/habitat/stressor/species integration

4. Restoration Coordination

- have Roundtable initiate discussions on a Central Valley Restoration Program
- Roundtable should describe the background principles necessary to coordinate programs (CALFED-CVPIA, State-federal, etc.)
- coordinate RFP with Four Pumps
- coordinate CVPIA Restoration Fund Roundtable and Ecosystem Roundtable

- meetings - reduce the number of meetings, increase stakeholder input
- have joint Roundtable meeting in October or November
- have update on CVPIA at next meeting
- have update and presentation on Anadromous Fisheries Restoration Project at the next meeting

Federal and State Flood Update

Bill Fakes (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) delivered the Federal and State Flood Update. He provided an overview of the four phase program. Phase I-- emergency response during the January floods, Phase II-- repair levee breeches, was completed in May, 1997, Phase III-- identify and implement non-structural flood control alternatives, is underway, Phase IV-- will include more comprehensive investigation for long-term flood control.

Public Law 84-99 was authorized in 1996 to provide funds for non-structural flood control alternatives on Federal project and qualified levees only. The non-structural alternative cost can not exceed the cost of a structural repair and must meet the previous level of flood protection. Funds cover the one-time levee repair cost and not for operation and maintenance. Projects are chosen on a willing seller/participant process. The deadline for participating in a non-structural alternative is August 1, 1997.

The Interagency Task Force has held two public outreach meetings and will hold meetings on July 24 in Yuba City and July 25 in Sacramento to solicit willing participants for non-structural repairs.

Each project must have a sponsor to operate the nonstructural repair, accept the land ownership transfer and participate in the project funding. So far, only governmental agencies have agreed to sponsor projects.

Roundtable comments:

- The Roundtable would like to participate in the long-term planning and help match ecosystem restoration opportunities with non-structural alternatives.